UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,935	12/08/2005	Shin Kurita	DK-US055289	1043
	7590 11/04/200 OUNSELORS, LLP		EXAMINER	
1233 20TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2680		00	NGUYEN, HOANG M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3748	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/559,935	KURITA ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Hoang M. Nguyen	3748		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 S</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-2 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	wn from consideration.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ır.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Expression of the second	epted or b) objected to by the Idrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See iion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Page 2

Applicant had amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 4, cancelled claims 3-4, and argued the 103 rejection is not valid because Yagi does not teach the cut portion, and the larger width is not facing the partition plate. The Examiner agrees, but a new ground of rejections has been made using a reference already of record, JP 57-176686, to show the roller 8 having larger width facing the lower side, and the cut portions 8a, 8b.

Applicant argued it would not have been obvious to combine the references. The Examiner disagrees because the modified feature is simply providing the roller with larger width in the multistage compressor. The multistage compressor using rollers is well known, it would have been obvious to replace one type of roller with another.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-099083 (Matsumoto et al) in view of JP 57-176686. Matsumoto et al discloses a two-stage compressor and a closed container 110, the compressor having two stages

Application/Control Number: 10/559,935 Page 3

Art Unit: 3748

121, 122, with rollers, a partition plate in between. Matsumoto et al. does not disclose the rollers having a larger width facing the partition plate. JP 57-176686 discloses a rotary compressor having a roller 8 in which one end surface is larger than the other end surface, said roller 8 having a larger width cut portion 8b facing the lower side, and the other end with cut portion 8a. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to replace the rollers in Matsumoto et al with the rollers having larger width cut portions facing the lower side as taught by JP 57-176686 for the purpose of providing better lubrication.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al in view of JP 57-176686 and JP 1134092 (Souichi). Matsumoto et al as modified by JP 57-176686 discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 1, but does not disclose a roller made from sintered alloy. Souichi is relied upon to disclose a roller made from sintered alloy. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to form the roller in JP 57-176686 by sintered alloy as taught by Souichi for the purpose of preventing abrasion.

Application/Control Number: 10/559,935 Page 4

Art Unit: 3748

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Examiner Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4861. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday--Friday from 12:30 AM to 10:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion can be reached on 571-272-4859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hoang M Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3748

> HOANG NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3748

Hoang Minh Nguyen 11/4/2008